



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/766,743	01/27/2004	Samson S. Wong	SUNMP382	2837

32291 7590 10/19/2006

MARTINE PENILLA & GENCARELLA, LLP  
710 LAKEWAY DRIVE  
SUITE 200  
SUNNYVALE, CA 94085

EXAMINER

CHASE, SHELLY A

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2133

DATE MAILED: 10/19/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>		<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/766,743		WONG ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b>		<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Shelly A. Chase		2133	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 January 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-17 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2,7 and 11-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 3-6 and 8-10 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.


### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 27 January 2004 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

  
**SHELLY CHASE**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**

### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2-28-2005</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

1. Claims 1 to 17 are presented for examination.

### ***Information Disclosure Statement***

2. The references listed in the information disclosure statement submitted on 2-28-2005 have been considered by the examiner (see attached PTO-1449).

### ***Drawings***

3. The drawings are objected to because the drawings as filed do not comply with the drawing requirements set forth in the MPEP.

### ***Claim Objections***

4. Claims 5 and 15 are objected to because of the following informalities: please change the dependency to correct the seemingly antecedent basis errors for instance claim 5 should depend on claim 2.<sup>1</sup>

Appropriate correction is required.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

---

<sup>1</sup> Note: For compact prosecution it is assumed that claim 5 is dependent on claim 2 and claim 15 is dependent on claim 12.

Art Unit: 2133

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims **1, 2, 7, 11 to 13, 15 and 16** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Saxena et al. (WO 96/42053).

**Claim 1:**

Saxena teaches the claimed invention. Saxena teaches a method and an apparatus for detecting memory address errors, the method comprising: a parity generator (115) generating parity addresses (117) ("generating a first parity address") (see fig. 1 and pg. 6 lines 5 to 10) and exclusive OR gates (122 & 124) encoding the address parity bit into two bits (120) of the Hamming code by hashing ("scrambling at least two data error –correction-code (ECC) check bits using the first parity address") (see pg. 6 lines 10 to 24). Saxena also teaches that hamming codes are error detection and correction codes (see pg. 4, lines 1 to 3). Saxena further teaches that the encoded bits are stored in memory (see pg. 6, lines 25 to 28).

As per claim 2, Saxena teaches a parity generator (208) generates parity for an address that is read ("generating a second address parity using the memory address") (see fig. 2 and pg. 6, lines 30 to 35). Saxena also teaches that data and hamming codes bits are read from the memory and two XOR gates (216 & 218) are used to produce a error code wherein the error code is an unhashed error code ("unscrambling the at least two data ECC check bits using the second address parity") (see pg. 7, lines 5 to 15 and pg. 8 lines 1 et seq.). Saxena further teaches the hamming code is used to check for address errors (see pg. 8, lines 10 to 15).

**Claim 7:**

Saxena teaches the claimed invention. Saxena teaches a method and an apparatus for detecting memory address errors, the method comprising: a parity generator (208) generating parity for an address that is read from a memory ("generating a second address parity using the memory address") (see fig. 2 and pg. 6, lines 30 to 35). Saxena also teaches that data and hamming codes bits are read from the memory and two XOR gates (216 & 218) are used to produce a error code wherein the error code is an unhashed error code ("unscrambling the at least two data ECC check bits using the second address parity") (see pg. 7, lines 5 to 15 and pg. 8 lines 1 et seq.). Saxena further teaches the hamming code is used to check for address errors (see pg. 8, lines 10 to 15).

**Claim 11:**

Saxena teaches the claimed invention. Saxena teaches a method and an apparatus for detecting memory address errors, the method comprising: a parity generator (115) generating parity addresses (117) from an address at input (104) ("generating a first parity address") (see fig. 1 and pg. 6 lines 5 to 10). Saxena also teaches that the parity generator is coupled to two exclusive OR gates (122 & 124) that encodes the address parity bit into two bits (120) of the Hamming code ("scrambling at least two data error –correction-code (ECC) check bits using the first parity address") (see pg. 6 lines 10 to 24). Saxena further teaches that for double bit error detection and

single bit error correction the XOR gates of figure 1 are used (see pg. 6, lines 20 et seq.).

As per claim 12, Saxena teaches a parity generator (208) generates parity for an address that is read ("generating a second address parity using the memory address") (see fig. 2 and pg. 6, lines 30 to 35). Saxena also teaches that data and hamming codes bits are read from the memory and two XOR gates (216 & 218) are used to produce a error code wherein the error code is an unhashed error code ("unscrambling the at least two data ECC check bits using the second address parity") (see pg. 7, lines 5 to 15 and pg. 8 lines 1 et seq.). Saxena further teaches the hamming code is used to check for address errors (see pg. 8, lines 10 to 15).

As per claims 13, 15 and 16, Saxena teaches that the parity generators and XOR gates are all part of a device ("memory controller") and are coupled to a memory device (138 or 234) through address input (104 or 208) and data lines (102 and 220, 222 & 228) (see fig. 1-2 and pg. 6, lines 1 et seq.).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 14 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saxena et al. in view of Borkenhagen et al. (USP 6754858 B2).

As per claims 14 and 17, Saxena does not specifically teach that the memory controller is coupled to a central processing unit (CPU) core and that memory is selected from a group consisting of a static random access memory and a dynamic random access memory; however, Borkenhagen in an analogous art teaches a synchronous dynamic random access memory (SDRAM) address error detection method and apparatus comprising a computer (100) with a memory controller (104) connected to a processor (102) and multiple SDRAM (see fig. 1). Borkenhagen also teaches that in computer systems memory read data originates in a DRAM (see col. 1, lines 63 to 65) and an address error detection can be performed for a DRAM or a SDRAM (see col. 5, lines 5 to 13).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the apparatus for detecting memory address of Saxena such that the memory controller is coupled to a processor and that address error detection can be performed for a DRAM or a SDRAM as taught by Borkenhagen since, Borkenhagen teaches the system provides an effective mechanism for detecting and correcting address errors (see col. 2, lines 20 et seq.). This modification would have been obvious because a person of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to employ a device capable of detecting and correcting multiple bit errors as taught by Borkenhagen.

***Allowable Subject Matter***


9. Claims 3 to 6 and 8 to 10 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

***Conclusion***

10. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Shelly A. Chase whose telephone number is 571-272-3816. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur from 8:00 am to 6:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Albert Decady can be reached on 571-272-3819. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

  
**SHELLY CHASE**  
**PRIMARY EXAMINER**